

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 remain in the application. Applicant appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 12. Applicant appreciates the examiner's issuance of a new, non-final rejection.

The Office Action requested that Figure 7 be designated by the legend "Prior Art" because only that which is old is illustrated. Applicant respectfully traverses. Figure 7 is a perspective drawing of images that may be displayed on a screen of an interactive system according to the present invention. It is not an illustration of what is old in the prior art. Applicant respectfully requests that this requirement be withdrawn.

The Office Action objected to the specification on the grounds that pertinent section headings were not utilized.

The specification has been amended to insert the appropriate section headings in the parts of the specification, as required. Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Applicant's admitted prior art ("AAPA"). The Office Action refers to the description on Page 8, Line 27, to Page 9, Line 12, as admitted prior art. Applicant respectfully traverses. That section of the specification is clearly under the section heading "description of the preferred embodiments". The description on Page 8, Line 27, to Page 9, Line 12, is a recitation of the advantageous features of the present invention. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 5-6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over "AAPA". Applicant respectfully traverses. The section of the specification between Pages 8 and 9 referred

to in the Office Action as AAPA is not admitted prior art, but rather a recitation of the advantageous features of the present invention. Accordingly, any modification of the teaching of that text cannot be utilized to reject the claims as unpatentable.

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has requested Applicant to state the differences between the X references in the International Search Report and the claims.

The *Doenges et al.* reference entitled “Audio/Video and Synthetic Graphics/Audio for Mixed Media” and the *Koenen et al.* reference entitled “MPEG-4: Context and Objectives” are simply a discussion of the MPEG-4 standard. There is little detailed information in the documents concerning implementation, and certainly no disclosure of combining a foreground CGO with a background object which has been transmitted as a broadcast signal.

The *Kidrin* (US 5,423,555) reference describes an interactive television and videogame system, including a videogame system 12, and a sync and VVI data decoder unit 14 incorporating a separator 21 and a multiplexer 22. The multiplexer 22 overlays and/or switches the videogame system signal with “live” video television signals. *Kidrin* does not describe the use of a broadcast signal comprising at least one data string with which any foreground object is combined.

The Office Action cited U.S. Patent No. 6,732,396 to *Laux et al.* in this application. Applicant respectfully requests that the relevancy of this reference be made of record since it is directed to a “self-wringing ratchet mop”.

In light of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant believes that all the claims in this application are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests the allowance of the claims over the prior art of record, and the passing of this case to issue.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail No. **EV 456684911** US addressed to the Commissioner for Trademarks, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on April 22, 2005.

By: Marc Fregoso  
Marc Fregoso  
Signature

Dated: April 22, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

**SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.**

Albin H. Gess  
Albin H. Gess  
Registration No. 25,726  
1920 Main Street, Suite 1200  
Irvine, California 92614-7230  
Telephone: (949) 253-2720